



**Queensland University of Technology**  
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Sadiq, Kerrie](#) (2013) Tax and equality in 1972: The case of *Lodge v FCT*. In *Queensland Tax Researchers Symposium*, 27-28 June 2013, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. (Unpublished)

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/61788/>

© Copyright 2013 Please consult the author

**Notice:** *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

## **Tax and Equality in 1972: The Case of *Lodge v FCT***

**Kerrie Sadiq  
QUT Business School**

This paper is part of a larger project described at <http://www.law.uq.edu.au/australian-feminist-judgments-project> as follows:

This project draws its inspiration from two significant recent developments in law and feminist scholarship. The first has been the emergence in Canada and the UK of feminist judgment-writing projects, in which feminist academics, lawyers and activists have written alternative judgments in a series of legal cases, imagining the different decision that might have been made by a feminist judge hearing the case. The second has been the incremental shift in recent years in the number of women judges and Magistrates presiding in courts and tribunals throughout Australia. As part of this project, a group of scholars will write alternative feminist judgments.

This paper is one of the alternative feminist judgements. The case used for this discussion is *Lodge v Federal Commissioner of Tax* [1972] HCA 49. In that case, a woman, earning income by way of commission in her occupation as a law costs clerk, which she carried out at her home, claimed to deduct from her assessable income child care fees that enabled her to devote time and attention to her work. The High Court held that no right to a deduction had arisen. It found that, although the purpose of the expenditure was for gaining assessable income, it did not take place in, or in the course of, preparing bills of cost. Further, the expenditure was of a 'private or domestic' nature. This seminal taxation decision, which prevents deductions for childcare, has broad financial ramifications for workers in the home and those with childcare responsibilities. It designates childcare duties as 'private', notwithstanding the need for these in order, particularly for women, to work in the public sphere.